

**BEDFORD PLANNING BOARD**  
**Town Hall— Selectmen's Meeting Room**  
**Minutes**  
**April 26, 2016**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Jeffrey Cohen, Chair; Lisa Mustapich, Clerk;  
Sandra Hackman; Shawn Hanegan and Amy Lloyd

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** None

**STAFF PRESENT:** Glenn Garber, Planning Director; Catherine Perry, Assistant Planner  
Cathy Silvestrone, Planning A.A.

**STAFF ABSENT:** None

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Residents-- Robert & Sandra Porter, Bryan and Jen Kezima, John Yauckoes, Julie Phylis, Nathalie Weicker, Dan Yauckoes, Alison Oates, Rene Levesque, Doug Paul, Sue Yauckoes, Brenda Kelly, Elizabeth Cann, Denise Steinberg, Alan Nelson, David Bernstein, Brian Devellis, David Powell (Finance Committee), Attorney, Robert Cohen (Toxikon Corporation) and Caroline Fedele (Selectmen); George Dimakarakos, PE (Stamski and McNary, Inc.) Attorney Mark Vaughan (Rierner & Braunstein); Bryan Melanson (Developer); Larry Reeves (Architect); Scott Weiss (Gutierrez Co.); Will Park (SMMA)

Jeffrey Cohen, Chair convened the Planning Board meeting at 7:31 PM

**Emergency Evacuation notice** - read by Lisa Mustapich, Clerk

Lisa Mustapich, Clerk informed the public that the best way to stay informed of town board & committee meetings, agendas, and minutes is by subscribing to E-Info. on the town's website.

*Note: All meeting submittals are available for review in the Planning Office.*

**DEVELOPMENT/PERMITTING**

- 1) 56 Evergreen Avenue—Special Permit and Definitive Subdivision Plan Public Hearing;  
Planned Residential Development (PRD)

The public hearing opened at 7:33 PM. Lisa Mustapich, Clerk, read a legal notice stating that the hearing relates to a Planned Resident Development (PRD) by Melanson Development on land at 56 Evergreen Avenue, under Section 9 of the Bedford Zoning Bylaw and the Bedford Subdivision Rules and Regulations. The project involves the construction of seventeen houses with related open space, interior roads and utilities.

The following documentation was provided in conjunction with the special permit application and its review:

- Memo dated April 22, 2016 from Catherine Perry, Assistant Planner, sharing 1) a summary of the proposed development (including information from preliminary discussions and a letter of guidance that was given to the developer), 2) background and property description; 3) information about current PRD proposal; 4) consultations from town staff; 5) type of development and zoning aspects; 5) information on developer's intention to acquire additional land; 6) change to extent of public way; 7) road width, length of dead end and emergency access; 8) access to Minuteman Bikeway; 9) sidewalks and paving surfaces; 10) stormwater management, snow storage, street lights and landscape provisions and 11) conclusion/overall view of the development.
- Special permit application dated March 28, 2016 for PRD (Evergreen Meadows), prepared by Stamski and McNary, Acton, MA
- Cover letter to Town Clerk
- Special permit application form (for PRD), applicant Melanson Development
- Form C - application for approval of definitive plan, signed by Bryan Melanson and Daniel Yauckoes
- Form J – Designer's certificate, signed by George Dimakarakos, PE, Stamski & McNary
- Abutters list
- Development statement, listing the development team and discussing the proposed development in relation to Section 9 of the zoning bylaw
- Stormwater narrative
- Representative conceptual building elevations and floor plans, prepared by Reeves Design Associates
- Plan set consisting of 13 sheets including locus, existing conditions, record plan, site development, layout and utilities, plan and profile (road), details, landscape plan and stormwater pollution prevention plan
- Town staff memos from DPW, Conservation and Fire Department.

Attorney Mark Vaughan, Riemer & Braunstein, reviewed the proposal's history, mentioning that at the preliminary stage in 2015, there was a consensus that a PRD approach was preferable to a conventional one. Attorney Vaughan shared that the original proposal was for 19 residential units; and now the current proposal is for 17 smaller and more varied cottage-style units. Attorney Vaughan commented that these dwelling units could attract residents who may want to down-size and remain in Bedford.

George Dimakarakos, PE (Stamski and McNary, Inc.) presented the plans and discussed various features of the project such as;

- 17 cottage-style residential units around a loop with a sidewalk, and visitor parking available near the private drive entrance.
- Approximately 70% of the land will be dedicated to common open space surrounding the development; an association of residents will be responsible for clearing/mowing the meadows and a Conservation Restriction will be granted to the Town.
- Water main looped through to Wiggins Avenue.

- Spoke about the tree line on the perimeter being mostly preserved and that the houses will be tucked into the slope behind Neillian Way with some earth removal.
- Direct access to the bikeway will be available for residents to reduce vehicle use and promote pedestrian and bicycle commuting. A public trail easement is being offered at the existing informal trail through wetlands at the west end of the property.
- Briefly reviewed stormwater treatment, topography of the site and discussed flood plain and wetlands conditions.
- Discussed proposed unit mix (all 3 bedrooms)—2 duplexes (**4** units) at 1,880 sf/unit, **8** single family units at 2,103sf/unit and **5** single family units at 2,291 sf/unit.
- Three of the dwelling units will be designated as affordable under state rules.

Mr. Dimakarakos mentioned that the development tract is approximately 10.7 acres. Catherine Perry's memo explained that the current Yauckoes Trust ownership is approximately 13 acres which includes a small parcel of land on the other side of Wiggins Avenue. Ms. Perry recommended that the intended status of this parcel, which includes a stretch of the Shawsheen River, be included on the record plan.

### **COMMENT/QUESTIONS**

Lisa Mustapich—(replies by Mr. Dimakarakos)

- 1) Are electricity and cable services underground? yes
- 2) Will there be a Home Owners or Condo Association? yes, a Condo Association, which will maintain the common areas. Residents will have Exclusive Use Areas, like yards but without total (fee) ownership.
- 3) What is the plan for mailboxes? Applicant will meet with the post office to discuss options. If a centralized mail system is put in place Board members asked that the location be shown on the plan.
- 4) Rubbish and Recycling? Will be curbside.
- 5) What will be provided to ensure privacy for residents' yards/decks? Any plans to install fencing? No plans for fencing, was considering using plantings (shrubs) for screening.
- 6) Will redbuds survive this far north? Developer will review choice of planting species.
- 7) Is proposed fire pit gas or wood fueled. Will not be gas fueled.

Sandra Hackman—

Spoke about access to the bikeway being beneficial; however, she pointed out that the existing trail runs through the wetlands which may be unsuitable for bicycles. Ms. Hackman welcomes retaining the old access between stone wall for the residents. Mr. Dimakarakos said that if an additional easement is needed for public access he would be willing to negotiate.

Ms. Hackman also wondered if broader public access to the open meadow land along Evergreen Avenue might be acceptable; Mr. Dimakarakos thought this might be possible.

Asked what the plans are for snow removal and storage. The Condo Association will be responsible and most likely the loop will be snow plowed and a snow blower will clear the sidewalks. The developer was asked to include storage locations in its Operation and Maintenance Document and show them on plans.

Was wondering if there was going to be enough visitor parking, especially during the holidays. Some Board members suggested to inquire how Hartwell Farms development's parking situation is working out as a comparison.

Amy Lloyd—

Asked if mowing of the meadows will be memorialized. Mr. Dimakarakos said yes, the Condo Association will be responsible for the meadows maintenance. Lisa Mustapich commented that she prefers frequent mowing of the meadows because long grass can be a haven for ticks. Others considered that the mowing regime should take account of impacts on wildlife.

Asked if the granite wall at one side of the entrance is going to remain and what portions of the stone walls can be preserved. Mr. Dimakarakos explained that they plan to retain the granite wall at the entrance, the retaining walls within the circle and a wall that leads to the right (south ).

Jeffrey Cohen—

What are the plans for lighting? Mr. Dimakarakos said they plan to include LED pole lighting in a few spots with an additional one as recommended by DPW. The note about bollard lighting at the path no longer applies. Mr. Dimakarakos also agreed to provide a photometric plan and include pole details.

Inquired about accessory structures. Mr. Dimakarakos said that there is potential to add sheds. The Condo Association would have to monitor residents regarding accessory structures.

Are there any calculations regarding the potential number of school age children as a result of the proposed residential unit mix? No calculations have been done yet—applicant is trying to mostly attract empty-nesters. Attorney Vaughan commented that the affordable housing units might attract families with school age children.

Brought attention to the list of technical comments the DPW provided— Mr. Dimakarakos stated that he is willing to work with town staff (DPW) to address technical comments/concerns.

Shawn Hanegan—

Asked what the market rate unit price points are. Mr. Dimakarakos said the market will determine that at the time, but he is thinking the units will fall into the mid-700k range.

Will there be walkout basements? Some of the lower units will have walk out basements. Will there be any mounding or fill added? Mr. Dimakarakos replied that some of the lower units will need fill.

Asked if the height of the proposed residential units will meet the new height requirements passed at Town Meeting. Attorney Vaughan said they expect to meet the new requirements, and observed that the PRD section still gives the maximum height as 37 feet but the measurement method has changed. The Board asked for measurements to be checked.

Asked the developer what type of pervious surface they are using sidewalks and certain other areas. Mr. Dimakarakos said aesthetically they prefer individual pavers to porous asphalt.

Asked if the affordable housing units would be evenly distributed between the dwelling unit types. The developer confirmed there will be one duplex and one of each of the two sizes of single family houses. Ms. Mustapich suggested that the developer meet with the Affordable Housing Partnership to obtain guidance on the designation and marketing process.

Karen Kenney, 33 Evergreen Avenue, shared her concerns regarding the effect the proposed project would have on the road (which has just been reconstructed by the Town but is awaiting its finish layer) and asked about time frames for completion of the project. The developer stated that the road widening is mainly on the north (open land) side but a portion of the south (residents') side opposite the wetlands needs to be widened by 1-2 feet. He mentioned that the project may take around 3 years to complete.

Ms. Kenney and many other residents that live in the area discussed traffic concerns. Ms. Kenney suggested incorporating a speed bump in the area where a group home is located. Julie Phylis suggested placing a stop sign near Evergreen Avenue/Nellian Street. Selectman Caroline Fedele informed residents that she would refer the issue of cut through traffic on Neillian Street to the Transportation Advisory Committee which deals with street concerns. A resident pointed out that there are no sidewalks on Evergreen Avenue. A suggestion was made to possibly obtain an easement for a new trail/path on the edge of the open land.

A brief discussion took place regarding the need to relocate and/or remove utility poles along Evergreen Avenue for widening the road.

Alison Oates and other Neillian Way residents expressed privacy concerns between their homes and the proposed development. Mr. Dimakarakos reviewed the tree line and explained where the proposed development is located in relation to their homes. Catherine Perry, Assistant Planner, pointed out that some earth removal is proposed from the slope near Neillian Way.

Jeffrey Cohen voiced that the Board would like more landscape detail regarding the perimeter buffer requirement.

A resident raised a question regarding lot sizes and spacing between buildings and asked if there are any regulations. Jeffrey Cohen pointed out that the proposed development is a Planned Residential Development (PRD) and that it has different criteria than a conventional subdivision. A second question raised was who will oversee the project? Mr. Cohen responded: town staff from Code Enforcement, Conservation, and DPW will be involved. For any significant changes to the project, the developer would need to return to the Planning Board for an amendment to the special permit.

Denise Steinburg, Nellian Way resident, spoke about some old pine trees that have become damaged and she believes are a safety concern. Ms. Steinburg wanted to know if these trees could be taken down. Mr. Cohen said he would arrange to walk with town staff and Arbor Resources Committee representatives to assess the trees.

A resident asked the status of the existing farm house. The developer informed the resident that the farm house will be demolished and this has been cleared with the Historic Preservation Committee.

Karen Kenney shared that some of the residents' basements on Evergreen Avenue get flooded and commented that she hopes the proposed project doesn't worsen the current situation. Ms. Kenney also pointed out that the road doesn't have the capacity for on street parking and therefore she would not want overflow parking from the development to end up on the street.

Jeffrey Cohen asked the applicant if the Condo Association would limit the number of vehicles per household. Attorney Vaughan reiterated that the proposed units are targeted to empty nesters, but no limit has been set on the number of vehicles per household. Lisa Mustapich suggested setting a limit.

Catherine Perry asked if the developer had followed up on its previously stated intention to investigate a second emergency access, potentially via the bikeway. The developer said they thought it would be impractical and that they contacted the Fire Department which indicated that installing sprinklers in the units is an acceptable alternative.

#### **ENDING COMMENTS:**

Overall board members were favorable towards the development and feel that the applicant has been responsive to comments made during the preliminary review. **Ms. Mustapich** reminded the applicant to be sure they contact Michael Rosen, Assistant Town Manager/ Housing Partnership liaison, to discuss affordable housing details. **Ms. Hackman** likes the unit sizes, sidewalks, open space, the sense of community the development will bring, but wants to ensure sidewalks remain clear of snow and would like public access to the open space to be confirmed. **Ms. Lloyd** articulated that although the easement to the bikeway is good, due to the mucky wetness in that area an additional easement for a future trail/path upland would be beneficial; especially for bicyclists. Ms. Lloyd also favors incorporating a trail/path along Evergreen, in the edge of the common open space, is pleased that the applicant is proposing to have the meadows maintained, is against the DPW's suggestion of including REV bus parking on the development site, glad to see the applicant keeping pavers and would like to further discuss stormwater treatment and lighting at the continued public hearing. **Mr. Hanegan** echoed some of the same comments as other board members, but added the following: he wants to get more details regarding mounding/height of homes and cutting trees (which trees remain or get removed) and how this would affect the appearance from Neillian Way and to ensure that the applicant works closely with DPW to address their technical comments. **Chair Cohen** agreed with Mr. Hanegan's comments and further commented that it will be good to have a photometric plan but that the applicant should consider lighting on the homes too. Chair Cohen expressed that the unit sizes fit a need in Bedford's housing stock and agreed with the residents that some traffic calming mechanisms, such as incorporating a *not a through way* and/or a *stop sign* is a good idea.

*MOTION: Lisa Mustapich moved to continue 56 Evergreen Avenue Special Permit Public Hearing to May 24, 2016. (Amy Lloyd seconded the motion)*

*VOTE: 5-0-0*

*TIME: 8:55 pm*

#### 2) 170-172 Middlesex Turnpike – Preliminary Subdivision (Zoning Freeze)

The following documentation was submitted in relation to the preliminary subdivision application for 170-172 Middlesex Turnpike (Bedford Woods):

- Memo dated April 22, 2016 from Glenn Garber, Planning Director explaining the current application, sharing basic details about the site, highlighting points from Bedford Woods regulatory history, further details in the Developer Agreement/Declaration of Development Restrictions, Other issues (fire access), and his recommendation on the overall preliminary plan application.
- Letter dated March 25, 2016 from Attorney Vaughan with attachments: Form B (Application for Approval of Preliminary Plan, Filing Fee and Preliminary Plan Set
- Email dated April 14, 2016 from Fire Captain Stone stating the only concern he has regarding the preliminary proposal is creating a fire access road for the new development.

Attorney Mark Vaughan briefly shared some history about the site. He explained that the property is comprised of two existing parcels located 170-172 Middlesex Turnpike, and that the applicant, Gutierrez Company, proposes to create a new subdivision roadway off Middlesex Turnpike and reconfigure the two existing lots (Lot 1A and 2A) into three lots (1B, 2B, & 3B).

Attorney Vaughan commented that the applicant is concerned that if their previously approved plans needed modifying, that there is a chance they could run into some conformity issues under the new zoning.

Jeffrey Cohen asked the applicant if they have evaluated what they can or can't do under the new zoning.

Attorney Vaughan responded that one lot most likely wouldn't meet lot width.

An explanation was given stating that the proposed preliminary subdivision plan was submitted not for the purpose of actually constructing what's shown on the plans, but to take advantage of the grandfathering provision that allows vested rights protection under the previous zoning from any zoning changes for eight years. It was noted that to freeze zoning the applicant needs to submit a preliminary plan (as now) and submit a definitive plan within 7 months.

Jeffrey Cohen mentioned the Fire Department's request to create a new fire access road for the new development. Director Garber said the Fire Department would like a second emergency access off Oak Park Drive; however, this would take more action and should not happen at this time. Catherine Perry mentioned that an access road off the loop of Oak Park is not considered feasible, but it would be physically possible to create one off one of the properties on the straight portion of Oak Park. Ms. Perry said this would need to be negotiated as no easement is in place, but the original site plan application for Bedford Woods mentioned providing two emergency access points. Director Garber shared that the DPW engineering submitted late comments requesting detail of any rear access to/from F.W. Webb, as well as acknowledgement of the future Phase III Middlesex Turnpike widening project. Director Garber also shared replies provided by Jennifer Howe, PE SMMA. regarding DPW's comments.

Amy Lloyd asked if the definitive plans will show access driveways. The applicant replied most likely.

There were concerns regarding the 45-day constructive approval period. Ms. Perry pointed out that this only applied if the applicant files a definitive plan; and that the applicant can take up to 7 months to apply.

*MOTION: Amy Lloyd moved to allow the preliminary plan to proceed to the definitive plan stage, such that new lot 3 B and new proposed roadway would be created at the Bedford Woods Office Park (170-172 Middlesex Turnpike). **Shawn Hanegan seconded the motion.** This vote of approval was based on the following: 1) incorporation of all known improvements associated with pending phase 3 of the Middlesex Turnpike widening project; 2) provision of full design detail and requested design waivers for the new subdivision roadway; 3) clarification of any reciprocal access easements with adjoining property at 160 Middlesex Turnpike (FW Webb Plumbing Company showroom) and 4) any other requirements that must be met for a definitive subdivision plan under Bedford Subdivision Rules and Regulations.*

VOTE: 5-0-0

**MINUTES:**

1) March 15, 2016

*MOTION: Lisa Mustapich moved to approve March 15, 2016 Minutes with minor amendments. (Amy Lloyd seconded the motion). VOTE: 5-0-0*

2) March 28, 2016

*MOTION: Sandra Hackman move to approve March 28, 2016 Minutes with minor amendments (Shawn Hanegan seconded the motion). VOTE: 5-0-0*

3) April 12, 2016

*MOTION: Sandra Hackman move to approve April 12, 2016 Minutes with minor amendments (Shawn Hanegan seconded the motion). 3-0-2 (Jeffrey Cohen and Lisa Mustapich abstained)*

**DEVELOPMENT/PERMITTING: (Continued)**

1) Springs Road—Planned Residential Development (PRD); preliminary discussion

Brian DeVellis, DeVellis Consulting Group and David Bernstein, Bernstein Development presented a preliminary, conceptual plan to potentially develop a 13.55 acre parcel comprised of three parcels: 614 Springs Road (owner Bernstein), 616 Springs Road (owner Hagan), and 10 Green Street (owner Pino). The idea is to construct eight cottage-style housing units geared for senior living, on a dead end road off Fox Run, and three single family houses off the end of Buehler Road. Mr. DeVellis pointed out that the properties are under agreement, there is access to the rail trail, the wetlands are in the process of being delineated and that he would like to return to the Planning Board in June with a formal application.

Shawn Hanegan asked if there is a need to obtain a street easement; Mr. DeVellis replied yes. Mr. Hanegan pointed out that the access to the rail trail is wet; and suggested that Mr. DeVellis speak with Elizabeth Bagdonas, Conservation Administrator, regarding the potential to include a densely packed surface on the trail. Mr. DeVellis commented that he is in the due diligence process regarding legal constraints on Buehler Road access.

Jeff Cohen asked will the proposed PRD be one or two projects? Mr. DeVellis said he would rather it be two separate projects. Director Garber briefly discussed the feasibility of this being two separate projects



and Mr. DeVellis commented that although he believes the project(s) can be conceptually done, more work is needed.

Due to the project being located close to the Billerica/Bedford town line, there was some concern regarding utility access. Director Garber confirmed that 100% of the project will have utility access from Bedford.

Sandra Hackman asked if Buehler Road's frontage is adequate. The conceptual plan shows a common driveway and it appears that there isn't enough frontage for houses; however, it was noted that there is adequate frontage for a subdivision road.

Shawn Hanegan (for informational purposes) inquired about condition of the bike path that is located in the vicinity of the proposed project. It was confirmed that this is the Narrow Gauge Trail that is maintained by the town and was recently resurfaced with stone dust.

Ms. Hackman advised the developer to propose a mix of housing types to meet the PRD requirements. Mr. DeVellis said he believes proposing two styles is an adequate mix. He was further advised to join sufficient units to create at least 20% attached types.

Lisa Mustapich asked if the developer plans on proposing condo units or having a homeowner's association. David Bernstein said he prefers a homeowner's association.

Amy Lloyd commented that the proposed development seems to emphasize vehicle scale versus human scale and added that having the two car garages sticking out in front is not conducive to walkability, community interactions and a pleasant streetscape. Director Garber agreed and asked the developer if the garages could be recessed in efforts to minimize the presence of the garages. Mr. DeVellis said they based their plans on houses constructed on the Cape, and that people want 2-car garages, but he will consider recessing them and there will be patios and porches at the front.

The developer was advised to discuss the affordable units with the Housing Partnership, rather than the Affordable Housing Trust. The concept is still being firmed up, so they are not sure if they will be proposing any yet.

Many abutting neighbors attending the discussion and shared initial concerns regarding the impact such a development would have to the area. These concerns included: 1) effect on the wildlife; 2) scale and density of project; 3) frontage concerns; 4) buffers/screening/tree removal/privacy; 5) inclusion of affordable housing units; and potential traffic. Some neighbors also voiced disappointment regarding transparency and the Planning Board not notifying abutting neighbors in writing. Chair Cohen explained to the neighbors that the Planning Board and staff have provided transparency to the extent required and that this is not a public hearing; it's a conceptual plan discussion in its preliminary stage. Chair Cohen further explained that when the developer comes before the Board with a formal application, the general public will be notified via Bedford Minuteman, postings at Town Hall, and Planning's website and Facebook page, and abutters will receive written notification. Lisa Mustapich added that the publicized public hearing is the appropriate platform where residents will get the opportunity to speak and be heard.

## **NEW BUSINESS**

Preliminary Discussion on Great Road Business Zoning RFP/Community Compact Market Study—

Planning Director Garber provided possible new language for the Comprehensive Analysis and Re-Writing of All Business District Zoning Along The Great Road, from Shawsheen Road to North and Carlisle Road Request For Proposals (RFP) for Consulting Services. Board members shared the following comments:

- Amy Lloyd and other board members thought the RFP should be based on qualifications first and then cost of the consultant. Planning Director Garber explained that state law allowed that to a degree, with evaluative ratings, followed then by the separate cost proposal.
- Sandra Hackman asked why the Finance Committee would want to be a member of the ongoing core participation group.
- Amy Lloyd asked if GIS professional Chris Nelson is aware how involved he may need to be in this process. Director Garber explained that the base mapping is not all that extensive over time.
- Ms. Lloyd asked if a Charrette could be held to help identify problems and solicit public opinion at a broad overview level. Director Garber explained that the first two meetings would accomplish something like that.
- Shawn Hanegan asked for clarification regarding contract process—Director Garber reviewed overall cost (lump sum) and said it can't be exceeded without requesting additional funding for unanticipated costs.

The Board later discussed the Town Manager's request to combine funding and efforts for the RFP and Governor's Community Compact-funded market study. Chair Cohen questioned who would be the lead. Board members seemed concerned with sharing resources. Director Garber suggested that some Board members discuss the scope of the market study with the Selectmen/Town Manager. Chair Cohen was concerned that the market study could possibly dilute the Planning Board's business zoning efforts, and then offered to be one of the representing Board members to discuss this matter with the Selectmen and Town Manager. Catherine Perry attempted to explain what the market study could offer to the existing zoning proposal. Director Garber asked Board members to review the possible new language he provided (the day of the meeting) and send comments to him individually so he could incorporate those edits in the updated RFP.

**OLD BUSINESS**

Pedestrian and Bicycle Plan implementation discussion—*postponed until May 10.*

**REPORTS/DEVELOPMENT UPDATE:**

---Amy Lloyd announced that she plans to attend the MAGIC Legislative Breakfast on Friday, April 29 and that she attended the Middlesex 3 permitting discussion with Director Garber.

---Catherine Perry reported the following: 1) Planning staff forwarded all required zoning amendment forms to the Town Clerk, for the zoning changes approved at Annual Town Meeting, for submission to the Attorney General's Office; 2) Alphonsa Lane subdivision began construction and cut down some trees that were not supposed to be removed; and 3) provided information from the Town of Concord regarding zoning changes that introduce residential Floor Area Ratios, which were passed at their recent Annual Town Meeting; Ms. Perry attended and has further notes of the discussion (related to mansionization).

--In response to a question from Ms. Hackman, Ms. Perry agreed to look into a missing curb ramp at one end of a crosswalk at the Bedford Crossing development, 54 Loomis Street.

---Planning Director Garber mentioned that Crosby Corporate Center IMU project has been on and off the agenda due to negotiations between the developer and Aspen Technologies. Applicant plans to return on Planning Board's May 10 Agenda.

---Chair Cohen asked staff to include approximately 30 minutes on the May 10 agenda to discuss thoughts on future work program priorities.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

*MOTION: Shawn Hanegan move to adjourn the meeting. (Amy Lloyd seconded the motion)*

*VOTE: 5-0-0*

*TIME: 11:07 PM*